

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 11-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1-9 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Schmid et al. (US Patent No. 5,659,164).

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to more clearly show that there is only one control sheet with operating instructions on it in the imaging job. This is supported in several places in the specification, including on page 5, lines 14-18, among others.

During the course of prosecution of this case, two interpretations of the control sheet 1¹ have been set forth. The Applicant has taken the position that the control sheet 1¹ is the beginning of a second imaging job. The Examiner has taken the position that this control sheet is within the same imaging job.

If control sheet 1¹ is within the same imaging job, Schmid no longer teaches the Applicant's invention as claimed, as claims 1 and 8 require that there be only one control sheet containing operating instructions within an imaging job.

It is possible that the control sheet 1¹ could be interpreted as the beginning of a second imaging job. See Schmid, column 5, lines 23-27. In this interpretation, however, the control sheet is only shown as appearing as the first sheet of an imaging job, which is also counter to the invention as claimed, wherein the control sheet can be located anywhere within the imaging job.

It is therefore submitted that claims 1 and 8 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, and claims 9 and 11-15 depend from claim 8. The dependent claims inherently contain any limitations of the base claim. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach, show nor suggest that invention as claimed in claims 1 and 8, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims.

With regard to claims 7 and 15, both of which involve the second control image, these claims have been amended to more clearly point out that the second control sheet contains information other than operating instructions. This is supported in the specification in several places including on page 7, lines 15-22, among others. This eliminates any conflict between the control images of claims 1 and 7 and claims 8 and 15.

It is therefore submitted that claims 2-7, 9 and 11-15 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Conclusion

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

Customer No. 20575
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, PC
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 222-3613